



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Barring the use of a few adjectives here and there that characterize the advocate rather than the historian, the book is a valuable review of an important subject. It shows an immense amount of faithful and diligent work in gathering the sources from many directions.

*A Critical Study of Nullification in South Carolina.* By DAVID FRANKLIN HOUSTON, Adjunct-Professor of Political Science in the University of Texas. [Harvard Historical Studies, Volume III.] (New York : Longmans, Green and Co. 1896. Pp. ix, 169.)

THE full understanding of our national development would, it has been said, be signally promoted by the issue of carefully prepared monographs dealing with the history of the several states in times since the Revolution. The third volume of the *Harvard Historical Studies* is such a monograph, and shows the value of the suggestion by the light which it throws upon an important episode in the history of South Carolina and the United States. Doubtless many of Professor Houston's readers will be surprised to learn that he was until recently a South Carolinian, for local prejudice, which might be anticipated, finds no place in his pages. Lack of perspective and other monographic defects are skilfully avoided, and the result is a plain, straightforward narrative, in lucid and interesting style, of events in which all students of American history are interested.

The first two chapters form an introduction to the real subject of the study. In the first the early attitude of South Carolina towards the bank, internal improvements and the tariff is discussed ; the second contains the author's interpretation of the history of the constitutional theories involved in the nullification controversy and of the attitude of South Carolina toward them. Chapters III.—VII. inclusive deal with the causes of nullification, the formation of the nullification party and the history of the movement down to the repeal of the Ordinance in 1833. In the final chapter the author states the results of his study. Seven appendices give important documents and a list of authorities.

The introductory chapters are not written in the judicial spirit and with the attention to details which characterize the remainder of the book. Here the author appears more anxious to adduce evidence in support of opinions bearing the sanction of great names than to form independent conclusions. The first chapter consists in large part of excerpts from speeches made in Congress by the representatives of South Carolina ; the conclusion to which these quotations lead is that Calhoun had so committed himself to the policy of protection in 1814–1816 that he could not at a later period, with any sort of consistency, doubt its constitutionality. This exaggerates the extent of his committal to the policy and fails to give due consideration to the explanation offered by Calhoun and his friends. The author appears so taken by forms of expression that he fails to perceive the real object which Calhoun had in view. An analysis of the whole speech, of which a few sentences are

quoted on p. 11, puts the question in its true light. The long exordium, occupying four pages of the *Annals of Congress*, urges the necessity of providing means for defense against a possible renewal of the war with England; six measures are advocated for that purpose; one of them is a protective tariff that will encourage the production of war supplies. A careful analysis and comparison of Calhoun's earlier and later constitutional opinions will show that the change which took place between 1816 and 1828 has been greatly exaggerated; if under the Constitution a measure may be justifiable for one purpose and not for another, there is no occasion for charging him with inconsistency because he advocated protection as a means of defense in 1814-16, and pronounced it unconstitutional as a regulation of commerce in 1828.

In his treatment of the constitutional questions involved in nullification, Professor Houston shows that he is entirely free from South Carolina traditions by accepting, as historically correct, the extreme national theory respecting sovereignty. The second chapter is an argument to show "that the states were not, when the Constitution was formed, and never had been, separate and independent sovereigns" (pp. 17-18). In support of this proposition the *Federalist*, Madison and the Pinckneys in the Federal Convention, and C. C. Pinckney in the South Carolina Convention, are cited. In evidence of so strong a statement the reader expects either an unequivocal assertion of the principle laid down or implication too plain to admit of denial; none of the passages cited in the *Federalist* belong to either category. It may be readily admitted that the spirit of the *Federalist* is opposed to the conclusion reached by the nullifiers and secessionists; but to assert that it positively refutes the fundamental proposition of their arguments overstates the case. From a speech by Madison this sentence, *inter alia*, is quoted: "The States never possessed the essential rights of sovereignty" (p. 18). But the sentence in this form is from Yates's minutes; Madison's own report reads differently, and puts the matter in its proper light: "He pointed out the limitations on the sovereignty of the states, *as now confederated*." The Pinckneys are represented as scarcely able to find language strong enough to express their condemnation of the doctrine that the states were separately and individually sovereign (p. 26). This is certainly an overstatement; earnest approval of a strong national government was as far as they went in the convention. The bold declaration of C. C. Pinckney in the South Carolina Convention (pp. 26-27) is used with telling effect; but to this one who is still unconvinced is likely to retort: What of Madison's striking statement to the opposite effect in No. 39 of the *Federalist* and in the Virginia convention or of the Federalist pamphleteer in Pennsylvania who explained that the Constitution did not need a Bill of Rights because it was formed by free, sovereign and independent states? A more discriminating interpretation of the debates over the Federal Constitution is that which takes account of all the arguments that may be adduced upon either side and concludes that indecision upon the question of sovereignty was the price paid for ratification.

The remaining chapters deserve strong words of approval, for much hitherto unused material is skillfully handled and made to yield important results. The thesis that Calhoun did not lead, but followed, the people of South Carolina is clearly proven; among the causes for nullification, economic conditions receive proper consideration in the abundance of proof that the distress of the state was due less to the tariff than to slavery and the low price of cotton, brought about by overproduction. The importance of the Union party and the part which it played in the struggle are given due prominence. Among the appendices the recently discovered letter written by Calhoun in 1824 is worth careful perusal.

FRANK MALOY ANDERSON.

*The History of the Last Quarter-Century in the United States, 1870-1895.* By E. BENJAMIN ANDREWS. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1896. Two vols., pp. xxiii, 395; xxii, 439.)

PRESIDENT ANDREWS, in these two sumptuous volumes, must perforce give every reader a vivid impression of the picturesqueness and variety of the events that the annals-writer finds ready at hand for inclusion in a narrative history of the United States since the close of the civil war. This past quarter-century of American life has witnessed a marvellous economic expansion. The economic conquest of our western empire had, indeed, begun before the war, and its processes had forced to a test the issues that the war decided. But the war itself, despite its prodigal sacrifice of economic resources, developed a volume of potential energy that,—given a sufficiently large outlet,—could but compensate the loss many times over. The continent was forthwith crossed and recrossed with numerous lines of railways. Two or three millions of young men who had been disciplined and trained in the school of war had come forth with ambition and efficiency tenfold increased. The war had been destructive of men, also, but it had not lasted long enough to exhaust the vitality of the nation. On the contrary it had acted as a magical tonic. The triumph of the Union, with the enactment of the homestead law and the accessibility of the public lands by reason of the construction of the network of trans-Mississippi railways, had, in turn, acted most powerfully upon the imagination of the artisan and peasant classes in Europe. The Western states established immigration bureaus, and vied with the railway and steamship companies in promoting the transfer of population from Germany, Scandinavia and other European countries to the new states and territories of our West. The Franco-Prussian war and the increasing rigors of the military régime in Europe accelerated the movement that enlisted mighty fleets in transporting millions of people to our side of the Atlantic. Most of these new comers brought with them a certain degree of industrial skill and some capital. Such a period of migration seemed to the dominant party an auspicious time for